

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 93 04:30:24 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #35  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 10 Feb 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    35

Today's Topics:

                                    CW by hand?  
                                    The no-code issue  
          What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?  
          You may still be asked to send code!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 9 Feb 93 12:06:14 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!udel!gvls1!news@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: CW by hand?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-----

Date: 9 Feb 93 17:38:23 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: The no-code issue  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

How many proponents of no-code, or of the reduction of the speed  
requirements, are from people who "can't do it?" Or from people who know  
people who can't [seem to, or are unwilling to] do it/learn it?

Asking, or demanding a change in the code requirement seems analogous to

demanding that a particular college or university lower its entrance requirements in order to allow people with less than sufficient high school grades and/or SAT scores to enter.

Ham radio is a privilege that is earned - it is not a right. This is how I feel, regardless of the fact that I am denied access to parts of the spectrum that I enjoyed as a General in the 60's.

Howard KE7QJ    hlester@as.arizona.edu

-----

Date: 9 Feb 93 22:24:12 GMT

From: news.service.uci.edu!mothra.nts.uci.edu!lockhart@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>In article <9302081436.AA27741@ucsd.edu> dwilson@s850.mwc.EDU (David L. Wilson) writes:

>>Part 97.5(d)(1) "A primary station license is issued only to a person,  
>>together with an operator license on the same document. Every amateur  
>>operator licensed by the FCC must have one, but only one, primary  
>>station license."

>

>Try looking KB6QMU and KK6CH up; compare the records, including birthdate.

>

>I think a VE made a mistake once?

>

>--

> \* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ                    | Views expressed here are

  \*

> \* (310) 337-5136                    | mine and do not necessarily

  \*

> \* dana@locus.com    DoD #466           | reflect those of my employer

  \*

> \* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

Well, let's see what marvin says.

>> call kb6qmu

Call-Sign: KB6QMU                    Class: NOVICE

Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI        Birthday: DEC 30, 1927

Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285

Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA

Valid From: APR 14, 1987            To: APR 14, 1997

Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987

>> call kk6ch  
Call-Sign: KK6CH                      Class: ADVANCED  
Previously: N6PFB                    Class: GENERAL  
Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI          Birthday: DEC 30, 1927  
Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285  
Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA  
Valid From: NOV 14, 1989            To: NOV 14, 1999  
Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989

Oops!

Dana's right. Wonder what's going on here?

-----

Date: 8 Feb 93 23:45:12 GMT  
From: olivea!charnel!rat!mimbres.cs.unm.edu!constellation!essex.ecn.uoknor.edu!  
usenet@ames.arpa  
Subject: You may still be asked to send code!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb5.200507.4227@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>>This could be a boon for the "this ain't like my test at the FCC  
>>office" OFs :-)  
>  
>Why, this is the way the tests have been done for the past several  
>years. Sure it isn't anything like the old FCC test environment,  
>but I don't think it means anything.

[Jud Ahern strokes his long, grey, OF beard, and says...]

When I took my 13 wpm at the FCC office about 25 years ago, and passed  
the receive test, they sat me down in front of a straight key and  
asked me to send. I was so nervous I just "chattered" on the thing.  
The examiner then opened the contact spacing to about 3 feet and  
turned the spring pressure to something like a bus uses for  
suspension. When I tapped a few horribly formed characters (at  
probably well under 13 wpm), he said that was fine. I like to think  
they knew most people can send at least as fast as they receive  
(if not smoothly) under non-test conditions, but felt they had to  
go through motions!

+-----+  
| Jud Ahern KC5RI                      Bitnet: jahern@uokgcn.bitnet                      |  
| Geology & Geophysics                Internet: jahern@geohub.gcn.uoknor.edu                |

| University of Oklahoma "Opinions expressed here reflect the entire|  
| Norman, OK 73019 University, in one convenient location." |  
+-----+

-----  
Date: Tue, 9 Feb 93 16:26:07 GMT

From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Feb5.200507.4227@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<1993Feb6.201812.27631@cbfsb.cb.att.com>, <1993Feb8.201027.15197@adobe.com>

Subject : Re: You may still be asked to send code!

In article <1993Feb8.201027.15197@adobe.com> swirsky@adobe.com (Robert Swirsky) writes:

>I became quite familiar with 201 Varick when I went for my  
>amateur licenses (never failed one!) and the Commercial telephone  
>and telegraph. (It took me more than 1 try to get the now-defunct  
>first phone.)  
>

>It would be nice if you still had the option of taking the test  
>at the FCC. If, for example, you disagreed with the politics of the  
>ARRL or other organization, you wouldn't have to depend of their  
>volunteers to get your license.

What does the politics of the ARRL or W5YI have to do with the testing?

I upgraded to General in December and took a shot at the advanced  
last night (missed by one question...rats). At neither test session  
could I detect anything related to organization politics. The tests  
were administered in a highly professional and organized manner.

You either passed or you didn't, a totally objective process.

As such, being tested through ARRL or W5YI VE test sessions certainly  
doesn't seem to imply support for either of those two entities political  
viewpoints.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.  
-----

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

Morristown, NJ

email via UUCP

bcr!cc!whs70

201-829-2879 Weekdays

email via Internet

whs70@cc.bellcore.com  
-----

Date: (null)

From: (null)

97.503(a) A telegraphy examination MUST BE SUFFICIENT TO PROVE that the  
examinee has the ABILITY TO SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND and to receive

correctly be ear texts in the international Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma, question mark, slant mark and prosigns ar, bt and sk.

97.509(d) Passing a telegraphy RECEIVING examination is ADEQUATE PROOF of an examinee's ABILITY to both SEND and receive telegraphy. The administering VEs, however, MAY also include a sending segment in a telegraphy examination.

(caps mine)

Now, the questions are: MUST an examinee PROVE that he has the ABILITY to SEND CORRECTLY BY HAND?

or: Since the examinee can copy 20wpm by ear does this mean he can also send 20wpm by hand?

--

Ed Naratil  
Amateur Packet: w3bnr@N3LA.#epa.PA.USA.NA

(All standard disclaimers apply)  
ean@VFL.Paramax.COM

-----  
Date: Tue, 9 Feb 93 14:30:46 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
bogus.sura.net!udel!gatech!mailer.cc.fsu.edu!geomag!zateslo@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9302050341.AA03133@netmail.microsoft.com>,  
<1993Feb5.200507.4227@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<C25LzF.K69@constellation.ecn.uoknor.edu>.ed  
Subject : Re: You may still be asked to send code!

In article <C25LzF.K69@constellation.ecn.uoknor.edu> jahern@geohub.gcn.uoknor.edu writes:

>

>[Jud Ahern strokes his long, grey, OF beard, and says...]

>

>When I took my 13 wpm at the FCC office about 25 years ago, and passed  
>the receive test, they sat me down in front of a straight key and  
>asked me to send. I was so nervous I just "chattered" on the thing.  
>The examiner then opened the contact spacing to about 3 feet and  
>turned the spring pressure to something like a bus uses for  
>suspension. When I tapped a few horribly formed characters (at  
>probably well under 13 wpm), he said that was fine. I like to think  
>they knew most people can send at least as fast as they receive

>(if not smoothly) under non-test conditions, but felt they had to  
>go through motions!  
>

I took both the 13wpm and 20 wpm tests at the FCC Miami office,  
a few years apart. The examiner for the 13wpm test listened to me  
send about three letters, said "That's fine, you can send" (the word,  
BTW, was "opinion"), and that was that. I drew a different  
examiner for the 20. After passing the receiving test, I was  
asked to send, and discovered that my keyer wouldn't work. The  
guy insisted that I send one minute solid. I tried using somebody's  
bug, with no success, and finally managed to send a minute of 20wpm with  
that worn-out J-38 on the table. I'm glad I was a limber 20-year-old  
at the time, and not the 36-year-old OF I am now...

Ted Zateslo, W1X0  
zateslo@geomag.gly.fsu.edu

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #35  
\*\*\*\*\*